

acts in the most difficult times. I hope for all of us that these appearances are few and far between.

May our thoughts and prayers be with the citizens of Geneva and Coffee Counties as they remember the tragic event that happened in their community 1 year ago today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THIRD FRONT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I bring you news from the third front. The battle wages for control of the border, and I'm not talking about the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan where the Taliban runs back and forth at will to commit crimes in Afghanistan and then goes and hides in Pakistan. No, I'm bringing you news from the border, the southern border of the United States, which is very violent.

In Reynosa, Mexico, right across the border from the Rio Grande River in Texas, recently the U.S. consulate closed because of the violence on the border. In fact, Americans are prohibited from being in that consulate office because of the kidnappings, the murders, the shootings, the Old West-style events that are taking place on this border town south of our border.

The inconvenient truth is there is a battle for the border that is taking place in our own country. Across the southern border of the United States the drug cartels, all in the name of money and their financing of illegal activities, including organized crime and violence, and working with the coyotes—those people, for money, that smuggle people into the United States—are seeking control of our border so that they can bring in drugs and people. It seems as though drugs and people are coming into the United States and going south are money and guns.

Someone has said recently that the northern border is porous and the southern border is porous. But at the northern border all you've got to do is walk across; on the southern border you can shoot your way across into the United States. But be that as it may, we have a problem. It's an inconvenient truth that we spend time on other issues besides national security of our own borders, and it seems to me that we ought to solve this problem.

But before we do this, we now hear this talk again, this talk by those who don't live on the border about, well, let's just give everybody that's in the country illegally a little amnesty. Am-

nesty for all is what they say. But these individuals that preach amnesty are ignoring the obvious: if we grant amnesty, that means all of the criminals that have come into the United States—like drug dealers, like those bandits that come here to commit crimes—they get that free amnesty as well. And they get the permission to stay here in the United States, not just those people that come here trying to seek a better life and to work.

Some have estimated that in our county jails and our prisons up to 20 percent of the people incarcerated are in this country from foreign countries. And yet we want to grant amnesty to all of these people? Amnesty has proven in this country it doesn't work; it encourages people to come here illegally.

So what should we do? We should do three things and we should do them in this order: the first thing we do is secure the border and mean it when we say we will secure the border. If necessary, we should have our military on the southern border of the United States so that people don't cross into this country illegally without permission of the United States. We have given lipservice to border security, and we haven't solved that problem.

□ 1400

You tell me, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest country that has ever existed, the greatest country militarily that has ever existed, the strongest country that has ever existed in the history of the world can't protect its own borders? I think not. We can do it, but we don't have the moral will to do it, and we have to make the decision that we will secure the Nation's border. The first duty of government is national security.

After we secure the border, we've got to deal with the immigration problem. The legal immigration system we have now is a disaster. It has been a disaster since the fifties. It is time to set that aside and to draw up an easier model, a more efficient model, a business model that solves the issues of immigration, a model that makes it more streamlined, efficient, and secure so that, when people come into the United States legally, we know who they are and so that we keep up with who they are—whether they want to be here as citizens, whether they want to work, whether they want to be tourists, or whether they're coming over here just to visit somebody.

Solve the border problem first. Solve the immigration problem second. Then deal with the problem of the 20 million-plus people illegally in the United States. We can solve that problem, but we can't solve that problem until we deal with the first two. It is time for the government to do its job. The duty of government is to protect us, not to give our country away to other people who want to come here illegally.

So, right now, the border war continues—controlled by the drug cartels,

controlled by the human smugglers who wish to make money and who profiteer from illegal activities on the southern border of the United States. We owe it to the citizens of this country, and we also owe it to the citizens of the countries which are south of the United States to secure the border, to fix the immigration issue, and then to deal with the issue of the illegal immigrants who are here.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCCOTTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WHITFIELD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRO-LIFE WOMEN IN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am here today, joined by my good colleague from the other side of the aisle, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER from Pennsylvania.

Today, we really want to focus this next hour on women in history because

this is the month for women in history. Toward that end, we really want to focus on women in history who were pro-life.

I would like to begin by talking about the fact that National Women's History Month traces its origins back to 1911, to the first observance of International Women's Day. Since that year, countries around the world have devoted each March 8 to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women, and they have recognized the many obstacles women have had to overcome.

In the United States, this day is celebrated as part of National Women's History Month, first established in 1987 by Congress. A similar resolution is approved with bipartisan support in the House and Senate each year, therein recognizing women here in the United States and around the world. Though, today, as I said, we are going to focus on pro-life women in history. I am going to start off by talking about a woman who began this movement in the United States way back in 1792. In 1792, as you well know, we were just becoming the United States—developing our Constitution, developing our institutions, our Congress, our Presidency, et cetera.

There was a woman by the name of Mary Wollstonecraft. This woman, Mary Wollstonecraft, was very, very pro-life. She actually wrote a book, "A Vindication of the Rights of Woman." In that, she condemned those who would either destroy the embryo in the womb or who would cast it off when born, saying, "Nature in everything demands respect, and those who violate her laws seldom violate them with impunity." She was really the first pro-life woman in the United States, and we have been blessed with many since then.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my good colleague from Pennsylvania if she would like to join me in this wonderful discussion.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Well, thank you. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for leading this special hour today to talk about the importance of women in history, particularly pro-life women.

I am just pleased that we can work together on this issue, one of which I find to be of great importance. It is an issue that really is not defined by party, that is not defined by geography, and that is not defined by demographics. This is an issue which, I believe, has national importance, and I am proud to stand here today with my colleague from Ohio and with my colleagues from other areas to raise our voices in defense of all in this country.

During the March for Life in January of this year, hundreds of my constituents from western Pennsylvania, pro-life advocates, visited my office in the Capitol. I spoke to a large group of Pennsylvanians who had traveled all day and all night. They'd marched in the cold to demonstrate their commitment to the unborn, and I was so im-

pressed by their dedication. Overwhelmingly, it was women and young women who came to my office to show solidarity in our cause.

When I go home to western Pennsylvania, where my district is overwhelmingly pro-life in its beliefs, I talk to mothers and daughters, women of all ages, who thank me for supporting life and who encourage me to stay strong in this fight.

It is so important that we have women representing the pro-life movement both here in Washington and in our districts back home. We can speak to this issue, I believe, in a more personal way than can men. No one can dismiss us for not understanding. No one can look at me and say, "You don't know what it's like." I have been in those shoes. At the age of 20, as a student in college, I found myself unmarried and pregnant. So I know what it means. I know what it means to choose life.

Today, we are here because National Women's History Month and pro-life issues do go hand in hand.

The suffragettes who worked so hard to secure our voting rights as women believed in the right to life. Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Alice Paul, and so many others whose names are lesser known believed in the sanctity of life as strongly as they believed in the rights of women. Women led the feminist movement, and women led the pro-life movement. Our voices are the loudest and the clearest for both of these very important causes. Contrary to what media or other organizations would have us believe, women can be both feminists and pro-life.

The bottom line is this: Respect—respect for women in the workplace, women in the home, in schools, and in the voting booth—and respect for the rights of the unborn. The principle that motivates both the feminists and the pro-life movement is one and the same, which is the belief that people have rights and freedom.

As pro-life women, we believe these rights and these freedoms belong also to the unborn. We believe they have the right to be born and the right to live. This is not only consistent with the legacy of the early advocates of women's rights, but it reinforces their beliefs in the rights of all Americans.

So I am happy to stand here today with my other colleagues in Congress, pro-life Members, who are speaking in support of women and who are speaking in support of pro-life issues.

I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you very much to my very good friend from Pennsylvania.

Right now, I would like to give as much time as needed to my very, very good friend from North Carolina, Ms. FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleagues from Ohio and Pennsylvania for organizing this Special Order today.

Today, we are marking National Women's History Month, and we are

commemorating the brave and principled women who have spoken out and who have fought for the unborn as well as those who have spoken out for equal rights for women in terms of our voting. It remains more important than ever that women speak out on behalf of defenseless, unborn children, for, each year, more than 1 million of the unborn are aborted in America.

I want to strongly agree with my colleague from Pennsylvania that one can be a feminist and that one can also be pro-life.

Today, I am pleased to highlight how some North Carolina women are standing up for the unborn back in my district. Two women in particular come to mind today. Toni Buckler and Donna Dyer are in the midst of leading a 40-day-long vigil in Winston-Salem to bring an end to the practice of abortion. Their efforts, dubbed 40 Days of Life, are focused on 40 days of peaceful prayer, of fasting, and of community outreach on the issue of abortion.

One of the most important and visible parts of their 40 Days of Life effort is the prayer vigil that is held outside the local Planned Parenthood facility in Winston-Salem. Every day between February 17 and March 28, they are bringing together concerned pro-life citizens to take a stand for the cause of life.

What is truly amazing about this effort is that it does not stand alone. Hundreds of other cities in 45 States have similar 40 Days of Life vigils, which seek to raise awareness about the scourge of abortion and to bring an end to abortion in America.

It is an honor to represent such committed pro-life women as Toni and Donna. Their efforts echo the voices of early women's rights leaders like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who stood up for women and for the unborn.

I want to thank all of the pro-life women who are participating in the Winston-Salem 40 Days of Life vigil. I commend them for their dedication to the pro-life cause.

With that, I yield back.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you so much.

At this time, I will yield as much time as he may consume to my good friend from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I want to thank the gentlelady, Mrs. SCHMIDT, for giving me the opportunity to speak on this subject.

Of course, for those who are in the audience, in the gallery, the question is probably, What does this guy know about National Women's History Month? Certainly, what does he know about women in general?

Well, what I can tell you is that a very important woman in my life gave me life, itself—my mother. She passed away many years ago, but, obviously, she is someone I can never forget. I have a wife of almost 32 years, and I also have two daughters, one of whom has gifted to me two grandsons. So I think I know something about the appreciation of women when it comes to

National Women's History Month. Let me just mention about abortion and about my pro-life stance.

Mr. Speaker, I really oppose abortion for four reasons. Number one, I am a Christian. I believe that only God can give or can take away innocent life. That is within his prerogative and within his power and his only.

Number two, as a physician, practicing for over 30 years, I believe in the protection of life. I don't see any way that abortion could be considered health care. Health care and abortion are totally different things.

Number three, as a scientist, I understand that, at the moment of conception, the unique DNA combination that results remains unique into history. That unique person can never be replicated by anyone else.

Number four, as a person, I believe that the only way that one can accept abortion is through something we call dehumanization. What do I mean by that? We human beings have the distinct ability to think of other human beings in a less than human way. What are some examples of this? Well, oftentimes, those who were pro-slavery gave certain explanations which would suggest that slaves were somehow less than human beings. Certainly, during the pre-World War II period and during World War II, we know that the Nazis used a similar characterization in order to justify what they did to the Jewish people and to many others.

I think that we have to deal with that today, that to accept taking innocent life, even if it is preborn, requires dehumanization, and I think we need to come to that recognition.

□ 1415

If we accept that the unborn child is indeed a human, then I don't see any way we can justify taking that innocent life.

I also stand today, Mr. Speaker, to just briefly mention that I think abortion is exploitive of women. There are a lot of reasons for this, and I will just speak to the area of health care.

Today, there are more than 3,000 American mothers who are victimized by a procedure, abortion, that ends the lives of small children, the small children they carry. The harm to women is real and the physical ramifications are significant.

As a physician, I can tell you that women who have abortions are more likely to experience more infertility, ectopic pregnancies, stillbirths, miscarriages, and premature births than other women who have not had abortions.

Studies have shown that women having had abortions are 3.5 times more likely to die in the following year; six times more likely to die of suicide; 7 to 15-fold more likely to have placenta previa in a subsequent pregnancy, which is a life-threatening condition for the mother and the baby, and which increases, of course, the chance of death or stillbirth; and twice as likely

to have preterm or postterm deliveries—and pre-term delivery increases the risk of neonatal death and certainly handicaps.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentlelady giving me an opportunity to speak on this subject. I think that anytime we think about women, we have to think about moms, and anytime we think about moms, we have to think about children, and those children, of course, are children, in my opinion, from the moment of conception. That is when life begins. And anything that disrupts that deliberately that is not of the nature of God is indeed the taking of innocent life and is not health care.

So I thank the gentlelady, and appreciate the time you have given me today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to refrain from references to occupants of the gallery.

The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

To continue with Women's History Month and to focus on pro-life women, I want you to imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it was like to be an American woman in the 1700s and 1800s.

It surprises me to have to say this, but at that time women could not vote, we could not hold property, we could not inherit property if we were married, we could not control our own money or sit on a jury or testify on our own behalf. We needed somebody to testify for us if we were involved in a criminal case. We couldn't assemble or speak freely. We couldn't keep our children if we were divorced, and sometimes even when we were widowed. There was no such thing as marital rape, and no woman had ever graduated from college.

Mr. Speaker, that almost sounds like some Third World countries today, and yet that is the kind of an environment women faced in the 1700s and 1800s. Once women realized that we needed to have our rights reserved in the Constitution, other feminists stepped forward.

One of those feminists was Elizabeth Cady Stanton. She was a pretty moxie woman, because at the time when women were pregnant—and you couldn't even say the term “pregnant,” I am not even you could say the term “with child”—they were supposed to stay at home and not be seen until the child was born.

What did Elizabeth Cady Stanton do? She shocked Victorian society, because she paraded through the streets showing the baby inside of her. And people were aghast. But people were also surprised at the voice of the message that she was carrying, because, you see, at the time of the feminist movement as we know it today with Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, they were fighting for all people's rights; not just the right of women, but the

right of the African American, man and woman, and also the right of the child, African American and white. They were fighting for everyone.

It was Elizabeth Cady Stanton who I think was the most shocking of all, because what she did was she showed her feminism on the streets. One of the things that she said was, “When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women that we should treat our children as property to be disposed of as we see fit.”

Now, think about that: “When we consider that women are treated as property”—I think you could probably put in there the African American as well—“it is degrading to women that we should treat our children”—at that time the African American slave child as well—as property to be disposed of as we see fit.”

This was a letter to Julia Ward Howe, October 16, 1873, recorded in Howe's diary at Harvard University library. So these are a pro-life feminist's words.

Mr. Speaker, her statue is in the hall just beyond these doors, and yet when I was a child in school, I never heard she was pro-life. I knew she was pro-woman and pro-freedom for all mankind, but nobody ever said she was also protecting the unborn. And yet she was.

But it wasn't just Elizabeth Cady Stanton that was holding these views. It was also her good friend, Susan B. Anthony. Susan B. Anthony, who also wrote, “Guilty? Yes, no matter what the motive, love of ease, or a desire to save from suffering the unborn innocent, the woman is awfully guilty who commits the deed. It will burden her conscience in life, it will burden her soul in death.”

Mr. Speaker, these words were written over 100 years ago. I want to repeat them. “Guilty? Yes, no matter what the motive, love of ease, or a desire to save from suffering the unborn innocent, the woman is awfully guilty who commits the deed. It will burden her conscience in life, it will burden her soul in death.”

Mr. Speaker, we hear that sentiment today from women who have had abortions and come around and realized that this was the wrong decision for them, and that they wish they hadn't made that decision, that they wish they could have made the decision for life.

But she wasn't the only person, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, or Susan B. Anthony, that felt like this. I bet most people in Congress don't know, Mr. Speaker, but we actually had a female candidate at the time of the feminist movement in the 1800s, and her name was Victoria Woodhull. She was the first female candidate for President.

December 24, 1870, this was the first female President candidate, a strong opponent of abortion. She said, “The rights of children as individuals begin while they remain the fetus.”

Think about that. First off, in 1870, long before women had the right to

vote, the right to have a divorce, the right to own property, the right to represent themselves in court, this courageous woman ran for President. Now, we know she didn't get very far, but criminy, Mr. Speaker, she certainly had a voice, and it is a voice that I think is a shame that history doesn't highlight, regardless of her message on abortion. Again, as a history major, I never knew that this woman ran for as a history major, I never knew that this woman ran for President in the 1870s, Mr. Speaker, and I will bet most of our colleagues didn't know that either.

But it wasn't just Victoria Woodhull that talked abortion. It was also someone by the name of Alice Paul. Alice Paul, another person that was part of the Equal Rights Amendment, stated in 1923 that "abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women." That was Alice Paul. She was the author of the original Equal Rights Amendment and opposed the later version of the ERA because it promoted abortion.

But before I forget, I also want to talk about Sarah Norton. Sarah Norton first challenged Cornell University to admit women. Think about that: Women couldn't go to college. Sarah Norton, right out there fighting to go to college, just as a man, also pondered whether there would ever come a time when the right of the unborn to be born would not be denied or interfered with.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we have to think about the way women were treated back then and why they came to this conclusion. Again, as I said a moment ago, they had no rights. They were very much like the slaves of that time. They had no voice, no right in court, no real rights at home. If they were raped, they had no way to address the rape. And if they found themselves in a situation where they had a child as an accident, there was no other choice but to either carry it and be like Hester Prynne in "The Scarlet Letter" or to have an abortion. And many times the people they were involved with didn't want society to know that they were the father of that child, and so they would force these women into a situation to have an abortion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there were no rights for women at the time. They couldn't go to court and say, "my neighbor raped me" or "I had an affair with a neighbor, he was a married man," kind of like Hester Prynne in "The Scarlet Letter." They had no rights. But they could be forced into situations that they disagreed with.

I think that is why these women who were so much at the forefront of the feminist movement were also at the forefront in talking about the right of life for all people.

What amazes me in all of this struggle is that up until the 1970s, people really didn't believe that abortion should be legal in the United States. There was a lot of controversy going on at the time, and I think I became involved in this movement because where I come from in Cincinnati, Ohio, a

piece of the Right to Life movement in the Nation was actually born in my district, or actually not my district, but the First Congressional District, the district that borders mine.

It was with folks like Barbara and Jack Willke and folks like my parents, who are from my district, that really realized that abortion could become the law of the land, and they wanted to prevent that. So they became very proactive at the State level. They went to the State legislature and talked with the legislators, telling them if they were going to consider having abortion legal in Ohio, that was the wrong thing to do.

They weren't unique to Ohio or unique to Cincinnati. This was really going on all throughout the United States, these little pockets of discontent about the issue of abortion, and they were beginning to weave together into a national movement.

But it is Barbara Willke who said to her husband Jack, a physician, "You know, Jack, the Constitution gives everybody the right to life, including the unborn child." And he looked at her and he said, "Barbara, that will be the name of our movement."

Well, we know that that name didn't just stay in Ohio, but there is also the National Right to Life Movement, and Barbara and Jack Willke have been at the forefront of this movement since its inception in the early 1970s. Jack Willke has served not only on the board of the Greater Cincinnati Right to Life, but he has also been on the board of the National Right to Life, serving as its president. Currently today he is with the Life Issues Institute, but he and Barbara continue to be on the forefront of abortion.

I am going to ask those wonderful folks if they could bring those two posters over for me.

Now, back in the 1970s, when the ERA movement was going around, people wanted to have an additional amendment to the Constitution stating in full force that women were equal and should have equal protections, but the problem with the movement was that they also wanted an equal protection for abortion.

□ 1430

At that time, the public really started to figure out where they were on that issue: Did they believe in abortion or not believe in abortion? And toward that end, there were a lot of mixed reviews. People certainly didn't want to have women suffer from back-alley abortions, but at the same time the question was: Should they have an abortion after all? And before the States could figure it out on their own, the Supreme Court, in 1973, handed down the decision of *Roe v. Wade*. And we all know what that said: that women have the right to an abortion.

Well, folks like Barbara and Jack Willke and my parents and myself were aghast because we really understood that life begins at its inception. And

you can't question life at its inception, because if you do, you compromise life throughout history. So we began to work very, very hard to end it.

What I really think is interesting is that while in the beginning of the seventies and eighties it appeared that women were on the edge of believing that women should have abortion rights, today the trend is changing. I have to digress a minute because the pro-choice women have been very smart on this. In fact, it was in the late eighties, early nineties, that they realized with ultrasounds that women were recognizing that that baby inside of their womb really was alive and breathing and moving and had a little personality. And so they started to wane back on whether they agreed women should have the right to an abortion or not. And so they made a language change. What they said was, instead of calling it pro-life or pro-abortion, anti-abortion or pro-abortion, they changed the name to pro-life or pro-choice.

Now the pro-choice, pro-abortion folks were very smart in that marketing approach because we as a society believe in choices, Mr. Speaker. We go to the grocery store—in my town, it would be Kroger, Meijers, Biggs, or Super Value—and you have an array of deli meats, you have an array of cheeses, you have an array of fruits and vegetables, and just anything that you're willing to pay for. In fact, in some of these stores you can even buy furniture. We love choice. How many restaurants offer a salad bar where you can get all kinds of salad? We like choice. You go to a department store and how many kinds of shirts and shoes and ties and sweaters can we buy? We like choice.

And so it was a very smart marketing strategy because at the time when women were starting to hesitate on whether women should have the right to an abortion because of the ultrasound, the pro-choice tag made them feel that yes, indeed, maybe women should have that right.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting, because as technology has come full forward and as we've had 3D with technology, women stepped back a few years ago—back about 10 years ago—with ultrasounds that we have today and recognized that even as a child is at the age of 2 weeks, it begins to appear to look like a child. And they started to hesitate on whether abortion should be legalized and women should have that right.

And if you look at this chart, what you see is that this was a Gallup Poll. A 2009 Gallup Poll. The majority of Americans—this was the first time, Mr. Speaker—a majority of Americans, 51 percent, consider themselves to be pro-life over the terminology pro-choice. So this isn't pro-abortion versus anti-abortion. This is pro-life over pro-choice, the pro-abortion marketing verbiage.

What we see is that in 2001, 40 percent believed in pro-life. Forty-nine percent

believed in pro-choice. Back in 2005, it was 42 to 52. In 2006, 45 to 47. We're tightening up. In 2007, 42 to 51. In 2008, 46 to 48. In 2009, 43 to 50. And in 2009, it has finally come full circle to where the pro-lifers are at 49 and the pro-choicers are at 44.

So we have seen this very narrow trend all the way through, finally eclipsing just about a year ago. And I think it's because women especially, but men as well, realize that that baby in the womb is actually a human being. And that human being deserves to have the right to life.

The other interesting thing that I think we need to talk about as we focus on women in history is that women really oppose the use of Federal funds for abortion. Even if they're pro-choice women, they just don't think Federal funds should be used for abortion.

Now, the late Henry Hyde—Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether you had a chance to serve with Henry Hyde. I did have the luxury to serve with the gentleman from Illinois. But it was Henry Hyde after *Roe v. Wade* became the law of the land that decided that maybe we shouldn't have Federal funding for abortion. And so in the appropriation bill he put in an amendment, which we still continue to use today, that said there shall be no Federal funding for abortion, period. And this has been the law of the land for the last 30 years.

And when you ask folks today—now this was a Quinnipiac poll, December 2009, and this was for women: Do you support or oppose allowing abortions to be paid for by public funds under a health care reform bill, well, 25 percent support it, 70 percent oppose it, and folks that weren't sure of the answer were about 5 percent.

So I really think that, Mr. Speaker, there's a real clear message here that women, whether they're pro-choice or pro-life, do not believe that we should have Federal funding for abortion. They just don't think that's a smart way of using taxpayer dollars. I have to agree because, Mr. Speaker, when we are discussing the bill of the moment—and the bill of the moment is health care, it's the bill that touches everyone's mind. It's a bill that is something that will be a game-changer in the United States, if passed.

One of the things that is in that bill is the public funding of abortion. From what I have gleaned, there will be a dollar of every premium paid to women's reproductive health that will allow for all kinds of things for women, including abortions. I think that when you look at the polling and you see that 70 percent of women oppose Federal funding of abortion, I think we should listen to the will of the people. And whatever we do on this health care bill, at least let's listen to the women of today. Because as we look at women in history, we really have to recognize that we do have a choice today.

My good friend, Dr. ROE, just came. Before I give Dr. ROE a chance to speak

on this, I want to mention that in women in history we've come a long way, but we still have a long way to go. And when you think about the first woman to try to run for President way back in 1870, I think it's ironic that the first woman to serve in this House was in 1917. Her name was Jeannette Rankin. This was 2 years before women got the right to vote. Yet, today in the House there's about 275 women in total that have ever served here, Mr. Speaker.

We have a lot of pro-choice women, we have got pro-life, we have got some that probably haven't made up their mind. But we have really got a long way to go when you think of the thousands of men that have served here. I think that's why it's so important, as we debate this issue of health care, to listen to women, because it is women that are saying. Wait a minute, not with my tax dollar.

Right now I've been joined by my good friend from Tennessee. I will give you as much time as you need, sir.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you very much for holding this Special Order on health care and the life issue. As I was walking over here, I thought back to my medical school years and how this issue of abortion ever came up. I followed it from the time I was a medical student, when abortion was illegal in this country, until it was legalized. At that time, pregnancy was basically a mystery. It was described as tissue. I've heard of a human being described in a lot of different ways.

But as ultrasound came along and we were able to view noninvasively inside the woman's uterus to see what was actually going on, an astonishing thing happened. I will tell you, after 30-plus years of practicing medicine, it will make your adrenaline flow to look at a baby and watch it grow from the time you see a flicker of a heart beat. We can see that around 28 days post-conception. I can remember the first time to this day. It's been over 30 years since I saw that. And to see that within weeks develop into a little person at around 12 weeks. And certainly now with the new 3D ultrasounds, it is amazing what you can see.

This is a person there. You watch them move, you watch them breathe, you watch their eyes blink, and so on. They're people. If you have any question about what's in the uterus, simply look at an ultrasound and there will be no doubt in your mind that it is a person there. I know that in our area certainly a higher percentage than even 70 percent oppose abortion funding using their tax dollars to end life. That's exactly what it is. It's certainly illegal in this country now. But I think the pendulum is swinging. We have a very limited amount of resources for health care in this country. I think we will talk about certainly the need for reform. But abortion is not health care. It is not. And we should not be using our tax dollars, as precious as they are, to provide care.

Let me just give you an example of what we're trying to do in our State of Tennessee right now. This year, because of the budget crunch, we're limiting our State health insurance plan; and Medicaid, or TennCare in our case, is limiting doctor visits to eight per year. So you as a patient, if you were a patient of mine in Tennessee and you had Tennessee Medicaid, you can only come see me, and that's all the State will pay for, no matter what your condition is. Also, we will only pay \$10,000 per year, no matter how many hospitalizations. That's all you're going to get paid. So those costs are shifted.

Right now, in Tennessee, with our Medicaid system, we're rationing care. What we should be doing before we massively expand the system is to adequately fund what we currently have. Certainly, funding abortion, not only is it just the public doesn't want it, it's the wrong policy. So I think the current bill that currently has this language in there should not be passed certainly in this body.

I yield back.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I thank you. I have just been joined my good friend from Minnesota, Mrs. BACHMANN. Would you like to add to the conversation?

Mrs. BACHMANN. I'd love to. Thank you so much. I appreciate the gentlelady from Ohio for inviting me. I also want to honor her for her service as the head of the Pro-Life Women's Caucus here in the United States Congress. We benefit greatly from your leadership, and we appreciate all that you do.

This is the first issue that all of us have to deal with, the issue of life, going all the way back to the Declaration of Independence. If you look at the Declaration, the inalienable rights, the rights that no government can give, that no government can take away, that were given to each one of us, a very personal right by our Creator, the first one is life. And that's why this issue is central in every debate that we have—how will we as an American government and society deal with vouchsafing life. Because in the Declaration it goes on to say that governments were instituted to secure the inalienable right of life. That's why we're here—to make sure that life is a value that we uphold and that we save.

I appreciate so much the chart that the gentlelady has put up to demonstrate that 70 percent of Americans oppose funding for abortions. That's what we're going to see in this health care bill going forward. I'm sure my colleague, Dr. ROE, had addressed that very well: that Americans don't want to have their tax dollars pay for other people's abortions and have their consciences violated. That's why we have seen the Catholic bishops all across the country so heavily involved in this health care debate, because they know what will happen.

The Alan Guttmacher Institute tells us that there will be more abortions if we have government-subsidized abortions. As a matter of fact, there will probably

be a good 30 percent increase in the number of abortions that we currently have today. That wouldn't be good for the women of America, abortion-minded women, and it certainly wouldn't be good for the next generation.

□ 1445

You know, in so many countries across the world today, whether it's Russia or in Eastern Europe or Western Europe, certainly Italy—Greece has a population replacement rate of 1.3—all of those nations are not replacing themselves. There is a very high level of abortion that is occurring in those nations. We don't want to see that here in the United States. We are at replacement, but our population levels could fall. It's not good when a Nation's population levels fall below replacement. The countries now, like Russia and in Western Europe, are dealing with that fact.

It's also a vital interest, just for the sake of abortion-minded women, that they have alternatives. All too often what we see are women that are put into a position that they don't want to be in by their parents, by pressuring boyfriends, to tell them, Have an abortion because it will cost me money. It will cost me embarrassment. But it's the woman who pays the price. The woman pays the price emotionally.

I have just looked at some figures that said that women who have an abortion have a higher risk of death and are six times more likely to commit suicide. That's such a terrible, horrible outcome for women. There are things that we can do for women who find themselves in an unplanned pregnancy.

We have pro-life centers all across the Nation that would love to help women, whether it's with free pregnancy tests, free ultrasound tests where they can see their unborn baby alive, moving within their womb. And then there is also help, whether it comes from free clothing during the pregnancy, free help with baby supplies once the baby comes.

If a mother chooses that she would like to have her baby adopted, there are services that are available that are free, open to women to help them with the adoption, and situations where women can actually help and choose the family that her baby will be raised in. There are great options for life. My husband and I have been involved in foster care, helping children as well who are in less than ideal circumstances.

I thank Dr. ROE for all the very strong work that he's done with the pro-life movement, and also my colleague Congresswoman JEAN SCHMIDT.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you.

You know, one of the things that I'm proud of is the fact that it's not just conservative women that have been at the forefront of this debate. As we all know, this debate, as I said before, began in 1792, and when Mrs. Wollstonecraft was the first pro-life

woman, she really wasn't that conservative. She was very, very radical.

One of the things I forgot to mention was that her name may be unknown, but her daughter's name is not. You see, if you have ever read the book *Frankenstein*, her daughter Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley wrote it. And this lovely little girl never even really got a chance to know her wonderful mother because her mother died giving birth to her.

But it was women like Mrs. Mary Wollstonecraft; it was women like Lucretia Mott; it was women like Susan B. Anthony; it was women like Cady Stanton who really brought this to the attention of America over 100 years ago. And even today, we have women from all over the country making a difference on this issue.

There is a group of women called Feminists for Life, and they've got some pretty liberal thoughts on other social issues in America, but they're really dead on on this issue. I had a chance to meet with them the other day, and Serrin Foster is one of the leaders in that. She wrote a paper that she gave to Wellesley College on March 3, 2004, that talks about the feminist case against abortion, and that's really where I got a lot of my literature. It's amazing what she talks about in here and how women throughout society who have had abortions, what social ills tend to fall to them, just as my good colleague from Minnesota brought up. The depression, the anger, the suicide rate. There's even talk that there could be some physical harm that could happen with abortion.

And I don't know if my good friend Tennessee knows anything about that, being the doctor that he is, but are there any physical risks to abortion?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Oh, certainly, there are. Again, thank you for having this conversation, because what you're doing today is that you and Michele are speaking for the unborn. They cannot speak for themselves, so you're here on the floor of the House speaking for them.

Yes. I mean, throughout my career, I remember a case that I had—and I won't obviously disclose anything other than just a case I had in over a 30-year career—of a patient that I had known for years. She came in one day and had tears in her eyes. This was a woman in her fifties now. And she told me, she said, I have to tell you something. I had known her for a long time very well, even as a friend I had known her. And she told me, I had an abortion years ago, and I have got to share this.

Many of the problems I traced back through the 20 years, 25 years I cared for her were directly related to that abortion and the psychological impact that it had on her and her life. And we had a long talk that day, just as a friend to a friend. I hope she left there that day and could go on and continue her life.

So many women won't share things that are very negative—or people, not

just women, but men and women both—a very negative part of their life that they're not very happy about and later realize it was a very bad decision. What we're trying to do here today is to prevent women from suffering that psychological damage.

And the other thing that Congresswoman BACHMANN just brought up a minute ago was adoption. As an OB/GYN doctor—that's what I do. I have delivered almost 5,000 babies. I can assure you, I can find hundreds of babies a home right now in one town. I can't tell you how many friends of mine that have gone to Eastern Europe, to Russia, and to China to adopt babies. And those are very lucky children who get to come and live with these families.

But why are we doing that when we have babies right here in America that you can adopt? And I will assure you that it would be no cost to the families. Those medical costs will be cared for by these families who desperately need and want children. And what you brought out about a life that is lost, you never have the opportunity to find out what that person could and would be, boy or girl. Maybe they will be a Congressman or a President or a doctor or someone who discovers a cure for—

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Or a Heisman Trophy winner.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Exactly. Or a Heisman Trophy winner. And even though he is from the University of Florida, and I am from Tennessee, I have to brag about that young man, that great young person. But those are the things that I think we have to talk about.

And the other thing that you hear discussed a lot, Congresswoman SCHMIDT, is that you will hear about third trimester abortions. It's about the life of the mother. And I have to say this right now, there are no medical indications whatsoever for that procedure, a third trimester termination of life. There are none. I will be willing to sit and debate with over 30 years of experience to tell you there's only one reason for that procedure, and that is to kill the baby. That's the only reason. And if anyone wants to debate that, I will be glad to do it here on this House floor or in a medical setting. But I want to make that a part of the RECORD today. We, again, are here today to advocate not only for the unborn but for the mother who bears the problem, the brunt of what happens to her.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. And I think it's interesting that as we continue to debate this since *Roe v. Wade*, sometimes the media inadvertently sends a pro-life message. There was a movie a few years ago which captured Hollywood's attention, and it was called "Juno." It was about a young girl and a young guy, high school age, and she found herself pregnant. I remember the scene vividly in the movie where she was going to go to have an abortion, and her friend was standing outside the

abortion clinic with a sign. And she said, "What are you going to do, Juno?" and she kind of sloughed her off. Her friend screamed, "It's got fingernails."

So when Juno goes in and she fills out the paperwork, she hears somebody wrapping their fingernails, somebody filing them, somebody chewing on them. And what does she do? She leaves. The end of the story, we know the outcome, she finds a wonderful woman who wanted a child, wanted to be a mother, and she gives that child to a loving arm.

Now, I know that sounds like a Hollywood fantasy, except I have someone very close to me who worked with me on a daily basis, and 11 years ago, he and his current wife, the lady he married, had a Juno experience, and yet today, they are a loving family. They had their own child, and they're doing just fine. I got to meet his birth daughter, and she is a beautiful young lady. Who knows in another 10 years or 20 years what she will aspire to. Maybe to just be the greatest mother of all or maybe be the next President of the United States. But he and his wife made that decision.

And so when I saw "Juno" and knowing his story, I thought, This is real. And yet Hollywood, for whatever reason, didn't see the power in the message. Mr. Speaker, I truly believe this country is recognizing that every life is precious, and I think what is equally compelling is the fact that last year in the Presidential debate, the issue of abortion took center stage, and it took center stage because a little unknown Governor from Alaska was suddenly thrust into the limelight and could have been the Vice President of the United States. And with her came a family, and in that family came their last child, and their last child has some issues. And most cases in the United States when parents are met after an ultrasound where indications say that your child will have a mental handicap, a mental issue, they are given the opportunity to abort the child. I think the numbers are—Doctor, am I correct?—about 80 percent do have an abortion when they believe that they're going to have a child that will not have what society deems as a "normal life." And yet she had Trig, and Trig has become the face of life.

I think it's interesting that as history continues to develop, that this wonderful woman, Sarah Palin, continues to be at the forefront of the media, and her child is right there. And together, that family is the face of life. And she is, I think, our most current and prominent member of women's history. Yet again, another woman who was pro-life.

I was hoping my good friend Mrs. DAHLKEMPER could get back. She had to go to a hearing. But I want to say that—is she here? Oh, good. Mrs. DAHLKEMPER just came back.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, my good friend from Pennsylvania, I want to give you

the opportunity to close this wonderful hour and to thank you for your participation and all that you do for the cause.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Well, thank you. And again, thank you to my colleague Mrs. SCHMIDT from Ohio, who has been a good friend and is obviously a defender of women's rights and a defender of the rights of the unborn. And to all those who have joined us here this afternoon as we have had this special hour, as we recognize Women's History Month and we recognize the women that fought for our right to vote, for our right to serve our country as so many of us are now; although, unfortunately, still only 17 percent of Congress. Those women also fought for the right of the unborn, and I think it's important that we remember that as we remember them and what they do for us.

As I was on a plane flying down here yesterday, I was sitting next to a woman who was from my hometown, and we were talking about many different things. And as we got up to leave the plane, in front of us sat her daughter and her granddaughter and her granddaughter with Down syndrome. She was telling me how it was only her granddaughter's second time to fly on a plane. One of the things that she expressed to me is that she is afraid that someday there will no longer be Down syndrome children in our world, and yet they are so loving and the beauty that they bring to our world, if you have ever known or been hugged by a child with Down syndrome.

We have a wonderful place in my community called the Gertrude Barber Center that just has done wonderful work with those children over the years. But they are precious. They are very precious, and I think that's the important thing here is that they all bring gifts to our world and they bring gifts to our lives.

When I think about, as I mentioned in the beginning, my own son who is now 30 and the grandchild that he's brought into my life and what he's doing as a young man, the value of all of these children, born, unborn, we have yet to see what they will bring to our world.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you. This is really a bipartisan debate. One of the things I know my good friend from Pennsylvania and I will agree with, there is nothing better than having grandchildren. It is worth having children, isn't it?

But to my good colleagues from Tennessee and Minnesota, do either one you have want to add anything before we lose this hour?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I agree with both of you. I'm not sure why I had kids first. I just need to go to grandkids. They are so much better. But I think that you can't imagine life—I know I have heard this right here—without our children and without our grandchildren. When you see a

child out there—anybody that would abuse a child, I have no tolerance for them whatsoever. But to have a hug from a child, it doesn't matter whether that child is challenged or not, it's love. And I can't imagine life without mine and my grandchildren.

I thank you for the opportunity to be here today.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And if I could just add, I think that it's so important that you have offered this opportunity for us to honor and recognize Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Mattie Brinkerhoff, Victoria Woodhull, Mary Wollstonecraft, Alice Paul, among many other women who stood strong for women's rights and for the value of women in the country, but also, to be clear, that these women also stood for the unborn. They weren't on a wild tear to make sure that women could have the right to an abortion. They stood strong for women's rights, understanding that it's all women, born and preborn, that need to have their rights secured.

So I am very grateful that you posted this Women's History Month, and especially highlighting the fact that our foremothers who went before stood for life, just as we stand for life today. So I thank you, and I thank Representative DAHLKEMPER.

□ 1500

Mrs. SCHMIDT. As we go back out into the hall and we look at that statue of the women who gave us the opportunity to be able to be here on the floor today, not only did they give us the right to vote, they gave all children the opportunity to have the right to life. And it wasn't until *Roe v. Wade* that that was taken away.

Maybe we can be the generation of women that will find ourselves with a statue out in the hall that will give all children, all God's children back the right to life. Thank you all for this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the Speaker.

I would like to begin an hour where I hope to discuss with my colleagues and with the American people the extraordinary situation we face with respect to health care reform here in the United States House. I believe most people across America know that we have been debating health care reform for almost a year now—actually, quite frankly, a little over a year now. And I think most Americans agree with me and probably with almost everybody who comes to this floor that our health care system needs to be reformed.

I have been a passionate advocate for health care reform since I was elected in 1994. I believe I have written more health care reform proposals and introduced them in this Congress than perhaps any other Member who began